

Date: Thu, 1 Apr 93 04:30:58 PST
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #82
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Thu, 1 Apr 93 Volume 93 : Issue 82

Today's Topics:

 2 meter phone calls?
 Another 3rd Party Question (3 msgs)
 The next attack on hams (3 msgs)
 The no-code issue (2 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Thu, 1 Apr 1993 01:49:49 GMT
From: swrinde!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!sdd.hp.com!hpscit.sc.hp.com!
icon.rose.hp.com!greg@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: 2 meter phone calls?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Gary Coffman (gary@ke4zv.uucp) wrote:
: 97.113(a) No amateur station shall transmit any communications the
: purpose of which is to facilitate the business or commercial affairs
: of *any* party. [emphasis added]

Shouldn't we define what "party" means? Anything you do involves, directly
or indirectly, *somebody* on the planet. I interpret the rule to say that
there cannot be a business facillitation involving anyone who is in the
conversation. To take your interpretation to the extreme would prevent any
discussion of radio equipment (because you might go out and buy one), any
sort of talk-in (e.g. a swap meet), or calling your wife to say you're
stuck in trafficking and will grab a burger on the way home.

To be effective in an emergency, we need to use our equipment and get to know how to use it and refine it. Occasional use of a phone patch is a part of building and maintaining that capability. If you can't open your mouth for fear of allowing some business somewhere on the planet to benefit from your actions, you cripple one of the main objectives of the amateur service.

Greg KD6KGW

Date: Tue, 30 Mar 93 15:29:39 EST
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!gatech!nanovx!
dragon!blackwlf!nj8j!ben@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Another 3rd Party Question
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

cfm1471@ucs.usl.edu (Morrison Charles F) writes:

> How come since before W.W. 1, the United States has been great allies with
> both the French as well as the British, and there is NO 3rd party agreement?
> I mean, we are supposed to be the "best of buddies" right? You know, lots
> of trading, and tourism, and the such. What is the deal here? Is this some
> sort of govefnmental red tape or what?

Dunno about France, but last I knew, third-party traffic is verboten in Great Britain even for the natives. Under those circumstances, obviously third party agreements between GB and other countries are right out.

Ben

```
+-----+-----+
| Ben Coleman NJ8J          | "All that is not eternal is |
| Packet: NJ8J@W4Q0.#EAL.#ATL.GA.USA.NA |   eternally irrelevant." |
| Internet: ben@nj8j.atl.ga.us |                               |
|   or   ben@nj8j.blackwlf.mese.com |   C. S. Lewis             |
+-----+-----+
```

Date: Thu, 1 Apr 1993 06:25:46 +0000
From: pipex!demon!llondel.demon.co.uk!dave@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Another 3rd Party Question
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <54R91B2w165w@nj8j.blackwlf.mese.com> ben@nj8j.blackwlf.mese.com (Ben Coleman) writes:

> cfm1471@ucs.usl.edu (Morrison Charles F) writes:

>
> Dunno about France, but last I knew, third-party traffic is verboten in
> Great Britain even for the natives. Under those circumstances, obviously
> third party agreements between GB and other countries are right out.
>

Not got all the details yet, but the GB 3rd-Party rules are in the process of being relaxed. Due out today (1st April, an unfortunate date for it) are some relaxations of our rules, which might include the 3rd-party stuff. If not, then watch this space -> <- !

73...Dave G4WRW (@GB7WRW.#41.GBR.EU AX25)
dave@llondel.demon.co.uk

Date: Wed, 31 Mar 1993 18:12:35 GMT
From: usc!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!darwin.sura.net!knuth.mtsu.edu!raider!
theporch!jackatak!jackhill@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Another 3rd Party Question
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

cfm1471@ucs.usl.edu (Morrison Charles F) writes:
> My fiance' is traveling to France this summer, and Im not looking forward
> to receiving the outrageous phone bills that await me.
Playing telephone tag across a single time zone gets tough...from
France are you in for some fun... ;^) (Geez, no, that was NOT a
Franco-Phlame ;^)

> How come since before W.W. 1, the United States has been great allies with
> both the French as well as the British, and there is NO 3rd party agreement?
The reason, as I have had it explained to me, for no third party
agreements between many countries you cite and the US is a function of
the existence of very good tariffed interconnection between those
countries. Third Party agreements *protect* the telephone (and
telegraph -- remember our own AT&T_! ;^) companies on each end.
Clearly, if your spouse-to-be became licensed, you could avoid the
entire third-party quagmire and just talk at will, band conditions
permitting, of course.

The issue *is* money, the very BUX you do not wish to spend, that have
prevented you from phone-patching into Europe (and many other
places)...

> Help!
There is none...

```

+-----+
| Jack GF Hill          Voice: (615) 459-2636   jackhill@jackatak.raider.net |
| P. O. Box 1685        Modem: (615) 377-5980   Compu$erve 76427,31 |
| Brentwood, TN 37024   Bicycling and SCUBA Diving      Ham Call: W4PPT |
+-----+

```

```

-----
Date: Wed, 31 Mar 1993 09:31:18 GMT
From: usc!wupost!emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: The next attack on hams
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

```

In article <1993Mar30.191712.2360@porthos.cc.bellcore.com>
whs70@dancer.cc.bellcore.com (sohl,william h) writes:

```

>
>Another thing to keep in mind is that there can be unity in strength
>if folks with different interests support each other. For example:
>How supportive are you of someone who wants to work on their
>car in their driveway. If you stand idly by while the town fathers
>"outlaw" doing repairs on your own property (yes, it has happened)
>or "outlaw" parking a pick-up truck in the driveway, then why would
>you expect those people to support a ham's desire to have a 75 foot
>tower?

```

Absolutely true. My right to keep a 70 Chevy up on blocks in the yard, or a neighbor to keep his 59 Caddy hearse up on blocks in the drive, is just as valid as a 75 foot aluminum tree in the yard, or a pile of aluminum antenna pieces for future antenna projects. The county has so far ignored the cars, but they cited me for maintaining a hazardous waste site because of the antennas.

Actually, most times the government won't care unless a neighbor complains. In my case the neighbor now gets a view of a 2000 square foot storage building erected next to his property line instead of a small neat stack of antenna parts 50 feet away. So it goes.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

Date: Wed, 31 Mar 1993 13:44:37 GMT
From: swrinde!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!uwm.edu!linac!att!cbnewsc!
k9jma@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: The next attack on hams
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1paip7INNpgm@dns1.NMSU.Edu> dtasman@NMSU.edu (Dan Tasman) writes:
>

>Most restrictins that I've seen placed on antennas are restrictive coveneants
>in new subdivisios. Those are not imposed by the city or a governmental body:
>they are imposed by the developer of a subdivision, and a violation of a
>restrictive covenant is a civil matter. Cities do not have the power to
>enforce restrictive covenants. I've seen many zoning codes, and very few deal
>with amateur antenna restrictions.

>
Ah, but the clever politicians and lawyers know that the local government
can _require_ developers to include such covenants as a conditon of
their being allowed to do business in that place. So the government is
able to make the regulations as restrictive as they want (PRB-1
notwithstanding). So your statement is _technically_ correct - they aren't
"zoning" restrictions; they are frequently enacted at the behest of or
on the advice of the local government although they aren't "laws". They are
real, pervasive, and so far unbeatable whatever their name.

73

--
Ed Schaefer K9JMA

Date: Wed, 31 Mar 93 18:13:11 GMT
From: walter!porthos!dancer!whs70@uunet.uu.net
Subject: The next attack on hams
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1paip7INNpgm@dns1.NMSU.Edu> dtasman@NMSU.edu (Dan Tasman) writes:
>I'm a city planner, one of those evil nasty people that get cursed out on 2M
>because of the strict antenna regulations imposed on amateur antennas. Wenever
>I ask someone who's sounding off about how restrictive the city zoning is, I
>tell them to quote the part of the zoning code that restricts ham antennas.
>They can't. Our zoning code is relatively strict towards building height and
>sign height, but as far as antennas goes, the only restrictions that apply is
>that the elements can't project over your property line, the antenna and its
>elements must be completely behind the front of the house and it must be able
>to withstand a steady 75 MPH wind gust. Nothing about height, size, number of
>elements or anything like that.

While I don't disagree with your city's situation, what happens in some cities and municipalities is that the addition of an antenna tower is viewed as an ancillary building and, therefore, subject to the building height limitations. Also, some zoning DOES include specific antenna height limits (e.g. not more than 10 feet above the roof line, etc.)

>Most restrictins that I've seen placed on antennas are restrictive coveneants
>in new subdivisios. Those are not imposed by the city or a governmental body:
>they are imposed by the developer of a subdivision, and a violation of a
>restrictive covenant is a civil matter. Cities do not have the power to
>enforce restrictive covenants. I've seen many zoning codes, and very few deal
>with amateur antenna restrictions.

I agree that MOST problems today are with restrictive covenants, BUT while city codes may not specifically identify ham antennas, there are more than enough towns and cities with some code that either directly limits the heght of towers, or the height of antennas above roofline, etc.

Standard Disclaimer- Any opinions, etc. are mine and NOT my employer's.

Bill Sohl (K2UNK) BELLCORE (Bell Communications Research, Inc.)
Morristown, NJ email via UUCP bcr!cc!whs70
201-829-2879 Weekdays email via Internet whs70@cc.bellcore.com

Date: Wed, 31 Mar 1993 16:18:58 GMT
From: usc!cs.utexas.edu!sdd.hp.com!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!moe.ksu.ksu.edu!
hobbes.physics.uiowa.edu!news.iastate.edu!IASTATE.EDU!wjturner@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: The no-code issue
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <93089.230010I010356@MAINE.MAINE.EDU>, <I010356@MAINE.MAINE.EDU>
writes:

[Various stuff deleted, but shouldn't have any effect on the following]
> The post was originally written be-
> cuase I, as well as many others I'm sure, are sick of hearing that
> no-code technicians are going to ruin HAM radio for everyone forever.
> I was not comparing the No-Code Technician License with the Code
> Technician license as it would appear, but rather the No-Code Tech
> with the Novice. I realize that the two provide different privileges,
> but it is my opinion that taking the extra test involved in getting a
> Technician Class license more than makes up for learning 5wpm CW. And
> in so saying, the test of technical knowledge amounts to about twice
> what you need to know to get a Novice license, notwithstanding that
> you need to know Morse Code. I plan on taking the code test, but I

> don't want the use of Morse Code to prevent me from being able to ac-
> cess the wonderful world of HAM radio. If I have to settle for the
> No-Code license, I will. I don't plan on spending the rest of my
> life as a No-Coder, I have more ambition than that. And please, no
> flames becuz I don't yet have my call letters. I will soon, believe me.
>
> JR

I for one, am glad you said something. This arguement has gone on way too long!! I basically agree with all of your opinios. I came in as a no-code, and after a year took the 5 wpm, General- and Advanced-theory tests. (The theory is the easy stuff for me.) Then, a few months later, I took the 13 wpm test. Personally, I think that is a great way to get into amateur radio. Who knows, if there was no no-code license, I might still not be in, and my whole family is hams.

Don't worry about flames 'cause you don't have the call. I didn't even notice it before, and I am sure most people won't care enough to make it the reason to write. The only follow-ups I've seen (including my first one) were about your misspeaking on such things as "no-codes can't transmit code". That is a reasonable mistake, but not true. I jus wanted to point it out!!

73 es cul (and good luck!!), Will, N0RDV/AA

--
Will Turner, N0RDV/AA
wjturner@iastate.edu | "Are you going to have any professionalism, |
twp77@isuvax.iastate.edu | or am I going to have to beat it into you?" |
TURNERW@vaxld.ameslab.gov

Date: 1 Apr 1993 00:01:49 GMT
From: swrinde!sdd.hp.com!col.hp.com!bobw@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: The no-code issue
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

<I010356@MAINE.MAINE.EDU> writes:
[lots deleted]

>
> OK, I knew that if I said something it would evoke criticism, so I
> will try to clarify what I meant. The post was originally written be-
> cuase I, as well as many others I'm sure, are sick of hearing that
> no-code technicians are going to ruin HAM radio for everyone forever.
> I was not comparing the No-Code Technician License with the Code
> Technician license as it would appear, but rather the No-Code Tech
> with the Novice. I realize that the two provide different privileges,

> but it is my opinion that taking the extra test involved in getting a
> Technician Class license more than makes up for learning 5wpm CW. And
> in so saying, the test of technical knowledge amounts to about twice
> what you need to know to get a Novice license, notwithstanding that
> you need to know Morse Code. I plan on taking the code test, but I
> don't want the use of Morse Code to prevent me from being able to ac-
> cess the wonderful world of HAM radio. If I have to settle for the
> No-Code license, I will. I don't plan on spending the rest of my
> life as a No-Coder, I have more ambition than that. And please, no
> flames becuz I don't yet have my call letters. I will soon, believe me.
>
> JR

JR,
I won't flame you for not having call letters. As far as I know,
every single licensed radio amateur at one time was without a
call sign. :-)

I think the "no-code" tech is a great entry level license (as you
state) even for people who plan to go on to higher license classes.
The FCC screwed up in the way they shoe-horned the no-code license
on top of the Technician license IMHO. In the long run, I think
we will see the elimination of the Novice license as the Tech becomes
the de facto standard entry point.

Bob Witte / HP Colo Springs / bobw@col.hp.com / KB0CY

Date: 31 Mar 1993 18:05:38 GMT
From: usc!news.bbn.com!levin@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <fritza.733424191@well.sf.ca.us>,
<1993Mar30.154403.29055@cbnewsl.cb.att.com>,
<1993Mar30.161536.9803@mnemosyne.cs.du.edu>
Subject : Re: 2 meter phone calls?

In <1993Mar30.161536.9803@mnemosyne.cs.du.edu>
jmaynard@nyx.cs.du.edu (Jay Maynard) writes:
|[This discussion belongs in .policy; followups redirected.]
|well, ok, next one :-)

|In article <1993Mar30.154403.29055@cbnewsl.cb.att.com> spf@cbnewsl.cb.att.com
(Steve Frysinger of Blue Feather Farm) writes:
|>I thought autopatch could only be used for emergency purposes (and not to
|>avoid costs), when it is not possible to get to a pay phone. Judging by
|>your comments above, it would be "legal" to autopatch home to tell my

